

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 221

May 25, 1995, 2:14 p.m.
Page S-7428 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/\$100 DoD Cut

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Domenici motion to table the Exon (for Harkin) amendment No. 1185.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 73-26

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

The Exon (for Harkin) amendment would reduce the defense budget by \$100 in fiscal year 1996 and would apply the \$100 in savings to deficit reduction.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote. Senator Domenici moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: A Domenici (for Craig) substitute amendment to the Harkin amendment fell when the Harkin amendment was tabled. The Craig amendment would have cut \$100 out of proposed spending for pig research in Iowa instead.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

(See other side)

YEAS (73)			NAYS (26)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (51 or 94%)	Democrats (22 or 49%)		Republicans (3 or 6%)	Democrats (23 or 51%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Craig	Boxer		Mikulski- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Grassley	Bradley		
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Snowe	Breaux		
Bond	Kassebaum	Bingaman		Bumpers		
Brown	Kempthorne	Bryan		Conrad		
Burns	Kyl	Byrd		Daschle		
Campbell	Lott	Dodd		Dorgan		
Chafee	Lugar	Exon		Feingold		
Coats	Mack	Feinstein		Harkin		
Cochran	McCain	Ford		Hollings		
Cohen	McConnell	Glenn		Johnston		
Coverdell	Murkowski	Graham		Kennedy		
D'Amato	Nickles	Heflin		Kerrey		
DeWine	Packwood	Inouye		Kohl		
Dole	Pressler	Kerry		Lautenberg		
Domenici	Roth	Leahy		Levin		
Faircloth	Santorum	Lieberman		Moseley-Braun		
Frist	Shelby	Moynihan		Murray		
Gorton	Simpson	Nunn		Pell		
Gramm	Smith	Reid		Pryor		
Grams	Specter	Robb		Rockefeller		
Gregg	Stevens	Sarbanes		Simon		
Hatch	Thomas			Wellstone		
Hatfield	Thompson					
Helms	Thurmond					
	Warner					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

The Harkin amendment is ludicrous on its face. The costs involved in printing the amendment and voting on it will be far more than \$100. This amendment, therefore, is just a stunt that is wasting taxpayers' money. Unfortunately, the amendment's sponsor is determined to have a rollcall vote. Senators on both sides of the aisle have suggested ways of avoiding this waste of time. They have suggested that they would pass the hat and raise a \$100 more for deficit reduction, and they have agreed to take both the Harkin amendment and the pending Craig amendments by voice vote. These suggestions were unacceptable to the Senator from Iowa, so we have been forced to go through this exercise of tabling the amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Harkin amendment would simply reduce the defense budget by \$100 and would apply the savings to deficit reduction. We hope our colleagues can agree that such a small cut will not hurt defense, and will thus join us in opposing the motion to table.